

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 18, 2005, Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, Examiner objected to two features from claim 10. Claim 10 has now been cancelled. The Examiner objected that gang saw was claimed but not shown in the drawings and similarly that a support frame was claimed but not shown in the drawings. The gang saw referred to in the claims are now labeled for ease of reference with reference numeral "17" and the specification amended accordingly. It is well known in the art that the collection of saws mounted on the arbor are referred to as a gang saw. Reference numeral 17 is added to Figure 2a. With respect to whether a support frame was shown in the drawings, applicant respectfully draws Examiner's attention to Figure 8 and the corresponding description in the specification wherein support frame 30 is referred to.

Examiner also objected to reference numerals 32, 34, 35 and 36 as not being mentioned in the description. With respect, Examiner's attention is drawn to the specification on page 11, lines 9, 10, 12 and 16 wherein a description of the elements corresponding to reference numerals 32, 34, 35 and 36 are found.

Examiner also objected to reference numerals 14 and 14a as being used to designate "sides of the cant". The specification has now been amended to clarify that sides 14 of the cant are the upstream sides, upstream of the chipping heads, and that faces 14a are the chipped faces of the cant downstream of the chipping heads. Specification as filed clearly supports this distinction.

The specification has now also been amended to insert the patent numbers corresponding to the referenced patent applications on page 1 lines 5-15.

The claims were objected to under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. In particular, claim 11 was objected to regarding the pivot axis. Claim 11 has now been cancelled. Claims 12, 13 and 21 were objected to as having insufficient antecedent basis for "said gang saw", and

similarly, claim 14 was objected to as having insufficient antecedent basis for "said sawing station". The claims have now been amended to clarify, as Examiner understood, that the cutting station includes a sawing station and the sawing station includes a gang saw. Examiner also objected to the limitation "a base" in claim 31. That limitation has now been removed from claim 31.

Claims 9-12, 14, 21, 23-25, 27, 32 and 34 are cancelled without prejudice to later filing of divisional, continuing or continuation-in-part applications directed thereto.

Claims 13, 15-17, 26, 28-31 and 33 were indicated to be allowable if re-written to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and to overcome any 35 USC 112 rejections. Those claims are now so amended.

In the Drawings

Applicant submits proposed changes to Figure 2a, as shown. Applicant requests that the Examiner consider the changes. A complete set of drawings is enclosed as required.

Examiner is respectfully requested to now pass this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Coe Newnes/McGehee ULC

By:



Antony C. Edwards
Registration No. 40,288

June 20, 2005
ACE/mh

Suite 200 - 270 Highway 33 W.
Kelowna, British Columbia, Canada
V1X 1X7

Telephone: (250) 491-0206
Facsimile: (250) 491-0266

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

MICHELLE HARDY
Name of Person Signing Certification

Michelle Hardy
Signature

June 20/05
Date